arXiv:1411.0354v2 [math.DG] 9 Apr 2015

DEFORMATIONS OF FREE BOUNDARY CMC HYPERSURFACES

RENATO G. BETTIOL, PAOLO PICCIONE, AND BIANCA SANTORO

Abstract. We study deformations of free boundary CMC hypersurfaces when the ambient space has symmetries that produce degeneracy of the Jacobi operator. We allow to simultaneously vary the mean curvature and the ambient metric, provided that the infinitesimal ambient symmetries vary smoothly. We discuss applications to free boundary CMC disks and Delaunay annuli in the unit ball of a space form.

1. Introduction

Hypersurfaces with constant mean curvature (CMC) have critical area among those that enclose a fixed volume. They are used to model interfaces between different media, such as soap films. Free boundary CMC hypersurfaces are particularly important in this regard, as they realize the natural physical constraint of allowing the interface to move freely about the boundary of the considered region.

There are many natural deformation questions regarding a given free boundary CMC hypersurface Σ_0 inside a manifold with boundary M. For instance, consider the problems of deforming Σ_0 through *other free boundary* hypersurfaces in M with with varying value of mean curvature, or *deforming the ambient metric* on M while preserving the existence of a free boundary CMC hypersurface. Any answer to these deformation questions carries an intrinsic ambiguity due to ambient isometries in M, and should hence be considered up to such symmetries. In the absence of boundary conditions, these problems have been addressed in [5, 6]. The main result of the present paper is a simultaneous answer to both deformation questions above for *free boundary* CMC hypersurfaces. The key assumption to ensure that such deformations are feasible is that Σ_0 is *equivariantly nondegenerate*, meaning that the only Jacobi fields along Σ_0 originate from ambient symmetries (see Definition 2.4). Under this hypothesis, we have the following deformation result:

Main Theorem. *Let Σ_0 be an equivariantly nondegenerate free boundary CMC hypersurface of (M, g_{λ_0}) with mean curvature h_0. Assume that g_λ is a smooth family of Riemannian metrics on M whose Killing fields vary smoothly with λ. Then, Σ_0 is the member $\Sigma_{(h_0,\lambda_0)}$ of a smooth family $\Sigma_{(h,\lambda)}$ of free boundary CMC hypersurfaces in (M, g_λ) with mean curvature h, which is locally unique up to ambient isometries.*

Further technical details on the above statement are discussed in Theorem 5.1. The core of the proof is a convenient formulation of the prescribed mean curvature

Date: April 10, 2015.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 53C42, 53A10, 35R35, 58D19, 58E12.

The first named author is supported by the NSF grant DMS-1209387, USA. The second named author is partially supported by Fapesp and CNPq, Brazil. The third named author was partially supported by the NSF grant DMS-1007155 and PSC-CUNY grants, USA.

problem (5.1), that allows to combine the Implicit Function Theorem and a flux of Killing fields argument to obtain the desired equivariant deformation. This is inspired on an idea of Kapouleas [15, 16], see also [6], which we adapt to the free boundary framework with varying ambient metric.

In certain cases, up to using ambient isometries, the family $\Sigma_{(h,\lambda_0)}$ determines a foliation by free boundary CMC hypersurfaces near $\Sigma_{(h_0,\lambda_0)}$. Sufficient conditions for this are given in Propositions 6.1 and 6.2. For instance, spherical caps are free boundary CMC hypersurfaces that clearly foliate the unit ball B^{n+1}_λ in a space form M^{n+1}_λ, see Figure 1. This fact is reobtained as a consequence of our main result applied to a flat disk $D^n \subset B^{n+1}_0$, which is equivariantly nondegenerate.

A more complex situation arises by considering CMC annuli instead of disks, which can be seen as a deformation of the so-called *critical catenoid*. This is the portion of a catenoid that meets the boundary of the unit ball B^3_0 orthogonally, and has been the object of several recent investigations by Fraser and Schoen [9, 10, 11]. We establish the equivariant nondegeneracy of the critical catenoid (Lemma 8.1), allowing us to deform it through other free boundary CMC annuli in the unit ball of a space form. These surfaces can be recognized as compact portions of Delaunay surfaces, see Section 8. In the particular case of fixing the Euclidean ambient metric and only varying the mean curvature, this family of Delaunay annuli containing the critical catenoid is formed by portions of unduloids and nodoids. These are rotationally symmetric surfaces that intersect the unit ball orthogonally and whose profile curve is the roulette of a conic section, that is, the path traced by one of the foci of a conic as it rolls without slipping along a straight line (see Figure 5). The critical catenoid corresponds to rolling a parabola, which is the limiting case of rolling ellipses or hyperbolas with eccentricity close to 1, that respectively give rise to the unduloids and nodoids mentioned above.

This paper is organized as follows. The basic framework for the free boundary CMC problem is recalled in Section 2, and preliminary computations regarding the flux of Killing fields are made in Section 3. In Section 4, we discuss the structure of the set of hypersurfaces with fixed diffeomorphism type in a manifold with boundary M that meet the boundary ∂M orthogonally. The detailed statement and proof of our main deformation result (Theorem 5.1) is given in Section 5. Issues regarding foliations by free boundary CMC hypersurfaces are discussed in Section 6. Finally, sections 7 and 8 respectively contain applications to free boundary CMC disks and annuli in the unit ball of a space form.

Acknowledgements. It is a pleasure to thank Rafe Mazzeo for many valuable suggestions, including the key ingredient for the proof of Proposition 6.1.

2. Free boundary CMC hypersurfaces

2.1. **Basic definitions.** Let (M, g) be an $(n+1)$-dimensional Riemannian manifold with boundary. We denote by $\vec{n}_{\partial M}$ the outer unit normal vector field to the boundary of M. This choice is used to define the *second fundamental form*

$$\mathrm{II}^{\partial M}(X, Y) := g\big(\nabla_X Y, \vec{n}_{\partial M}\big).$$

The main objects studied in this paper are compact hypersurfaces Σ of M, whose boundary $\partial\Sigma$ lies in ∂M. In order to simplify notation for these objects, we identify embeddings $x\colon \Sigma \hookrightarrow M$ with their image $x(\Sigma) \subset M$.

Definition 2.1. We say that a hypersurface $\Sigma \subset M$ is *admissible* if

(a) $\Sigma \cap \partial M = \partial\Sigma$;
(b) the normal bundle $T\Sigma^\perp$ is orientable.

If, in addition, $\vec{n}_{\partial M}(p) \in T_p\Sigma$ for all $p \in \partial\Sigma$, we say Σ is *normal*. An admissible hypersurface Σ is said to *bound a finite volume* if

(c) $M \setminus \Sigma = \Omega_1 \cup \Omega_2$, with $\overline{\Omega}_1$ compact and $\Omega_1 \cap \Omega_2 = \emptyset$.

Remark 2.2. Note that if Σ is normal, then Σ and ∂M are transverse submanifolds. Moreover, for all $p \in \partial\Sigma$, $\vec{n}_{\partial M}(p) \in T_p(\partial\Sigma)^\perp \cap T_p\Sigma$.

Remark 2.3. Observe also that the properties (a), (b) and (c) in Definition 2.1 are stable under C^1-perturbations of Σ.

Given an admissible hypersurface Σ, we choose an orientation for $T\Sigma^\perp$, and denote by $\vec{n}_\Sigma$ the positively oriented unit normal vector field along Σ. When Σ bounds a finite volume, the positive orientation of $T\Sigma^\perp$ is chosen to point toward the bounded region Ω_1. The *second fundamental form of* Σ is given by

$$\mathrm{II}^\Sigma(X,Y) := g\big(\nabla_X Y, \vec{n}_\Sigma\big),$$

whose trace is called the *mean curvature function* H_Σ. The *mean curvature vector* of Σ is defined as $\vec{H}_\Sigma := H_\Sigma\, \vec{n}_\Sigma$. If H_Σ is constant, Σ is called a *constant mean curvature hypersurface* (or *CMC hypersurface*), and a *minimal hypersurface* if this constant is zero.

2.2. **Regularity assumptions.** The central idea of the present paper is to consider *perturbations* of a given free boundary CMC hypersurface $\Sigma_0 \subset M$ by nearby admissible normal hypersurfaces. Note that the CMC condition implies that Σ_0 is necessarily smooth. A technical, nevertheless essential, point is to establish an appropriate notion of regularity for perturbed hypersurfaces and, related to this choice, a notion of topology in the set of hypersurfaces of M. As it will be discussed in Section 4, the set of perturbations of Σ_0 having a given regularity can be parametrized, via normal exponential, by real-valued functions on Σ_0 having the same regularity.

There are two issues related to the choice of regularity: the question of Fredholmness for the Jacobi operator (see Subsection 2.3), and, more specifically for the present work, the question of existence of a bounded right-inverse for the map that carries a function on a compact manifold to its normal derivative along the boundary (see Subsection 4).

A customary choice when studying variations of a CMC hypersurface is to require a Hölder-type regularity $C^{2,\alpha}$, for some $\alpha \in (0,1)$. This provides the correct framework for the Fredholmness of the Jacobi operator, see below, as well as for the right-inverse problem, via a Whitney-type extension theorem (see [32, Chap. VI]). We will use throughout $C^{2,\alpha}$-regularity assumptions, which will put us in the framework of (non-separable) *Banach* manifolds.

An alternative (separable) *Hilbert* manifold approach could be obtained by requiring a Sobolev-type H^s-regularity; using standard Sobolev embedding theorems (see for instance [2, Ch. 2, § 9, Thm. 2.30, p. 50]), in order to have inclusion in C^2, one needs to assume that $s > 2 + \frac{1}{2}\dim(\Sigma) = 2 + \frac{n}{2}$. Also in this case, Fredholmness for the Jacobi operator is obtained readily from the Fredholmness of the Laplacian, and the right-inverse question is answered by the Sobolev Trace Theorem for the normal derivative (see [19, Thm. 8.3, p. 39]).

2.3. **Jacobi fields.** Given a free boundary CMC hypersurface $x_0\colon \Sigma \hookrightarrow M$, denote by J_{x_0} its *Jacobi operator*, which is the second-order linear differential operator

$$J_{x_0}(\psi) := \Delta_\Sigma \psi - \big(\|\mathrm{I\!I}^\Sigma\|^2 + \mathrm{Ric}_g(\vec{n}_\Sigma, \vec{n}_\Sigma)\big)\psi, \tag{2.1}$$

defined on the space of C^2 functions $\psi\colon \Sigma \to \mathbb{R}$. In the above, Δ_Σ is the (nonnegative) Laplacian of $\big(\Sigma, x_0^*(g)\big)$ and $\|\mathrm{I\!I}^\Sigma\|^2$ is the squared Hilbert-Schmidt norm of the second fundamental form of $x_0\colon \Sigma \hookrightarrow M$. A *Jacobi field* along x_0 is a smooth function $\psi\colon \Sigma \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $J_{x_0}(\psi) = 0$.

Let $x_r\colon \Sigma \hookrightarrow M$, $r \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$, be a smooth variation of x_0, where each x_r is a CMC embedding with mean curvature H_r. Let $V = \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}r}\big|_{r=0} x_r$ be the corresponding variational vector field. Then $\psi_V := g\big(V, \vec{n}_\Sigma\big)$ satisfies

$$J_{x_0}(\psi_V) = \tfrac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}r}\big|_{r=0} H_r, \tag{2.2}$$

so that ψ_V is a Jacobi field exactly when $H_r \equiv H_0$ to first order as $r \to 0$. Thus, J_{x_0} is interpreted as the linearization of the mean curvature H_Σ at $x_0(\Sigma)$. Furthermore, if each x_r is a free boundary CMC hypersurface, then $\psi = \psi_V$ satisfies the *linearized free boundary condition*

$$g\big(\nabla\psi, \vec{n}_{\partial M}\big) + \mathrm{I\!I}^{\partial M}\big(\vec{n}_\Sigma, \vec{n}_\Sigma\big)\,\psi = 0. \tag{2.3}$$

The restriction of J_{x_0} to the closed subspace

$$C^{2,\alpha}_\partial(\Sigma) := \big\{\psi \in C^{2,\alpha}(\Sigma) : g\big(\nabla\psi, \vec{n}_{\partial M}\big) + \mathrm{I\!I}^{\partial M}\big(\vec{n}_\Sigma, \vec{n}_\Sigma\big)\,\psi = 0\big\} \tag{2.4}$$

is a Fredholm operator of index zero that takes values in $C^{0,\alpha}(\Sigma)$, see [21, Sec 2]. The free boundary CMC hypersurface $x_0\colon \Sigma \hookrightarrow M$ is called *nondegenerate* if $\ker J_{x_0} \cap C^{2,\alpha}_\partial(\Sigma) = \{0\}$, that is, if $J_{x_0}\colon C^{2,\alpha}_\partial(\Sigma) \to C^{0,\alpha}(\Sigma)$ is an isomorphism. The dimension of $\ker J_{x_0} \cap C^{2,\alpha}_\partial(\Sigma)$ is called the *nullity* of x_0.

2.4. **Killing-Jacobi fields.** We say that a (local) vector field K on M is a *(local) Killing vector field* if $K_p \in T_p(\partial M)$ for all $p \in \partial M$ in the domain of K, and $\mathcal{L}_K g = 0$.

Given a free boundary CMC hypersurface $x_0\colon \Sigma \hookrightarrow M$, every local Killing vector field K whose domain contains $x_0(\Sigma)$ induces a Jacobi field

$$\psi_K := g(K, \vec{n}_\Sigma) \tag{2.5}$$

along x_0, with $\psi_K \in C^{2,\alpha}_\partial(\Sigma)$. Indeed, denote by I_s, $s \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$, the local flow of K. Since each I_s is a local isometry that preserves ∂M, the embeddings $x_s = I_s \circ x_0$ are free boundary CMC hypersurfaces with the same mean curvature as x_0. Recalling formula (2.2), this implies that ψ_K is a Jacobi field in $C^{2,\alpha}_\partial(\Sigma)$. Jacobi fields of the form (2.5) are called *Killing-Jacobi fields*.

Definition 2.4. The free boundary CMC hypersurface $x_0\colon \Sigma \hookrightarrow M$ is called *equivariantly nondegenerate* if $\ker J_{x_0} \cap C^{2,\alpha}_\partial(\Sigma)$ consists only of Killing-Jacobi fields.

Given a free boundary CMC hypersurface $x\colon \Sigma \to M$ and a local isometry I of (M, g) whose domain contains $x(\Sigma)$, then $I \circ x$ is another free boundary CMC hypersurface. Local isometries of (M, g) preserve ∂M, and therefore also the orthogonality condition. Free boundary CMC embeddings $x, x'\colon \Sigma \hookrightarrow M$ are said to be *congruent* if there exists a local isometry I of (M, g) such that $I\big(x(\Sigma)\big) = x'(\Sigma)$.

3. Flux of Killing fields

In preparation for the proof of our main result, we study the flux of Killing vector fields across hypersurfaces. This provides a convenient approach to study the equation $H_\Sigma \equiv$ const. modulo ambient isometries, which originates from the work of Kapouleas [15, 16], see also [6].

Proposition 3.1. *Let $\Sigma \subset M$ be an admissible hypersurface and K be a Killing vector field on M.*

(A) *If Σ is normal, then*

$$\int_\Sigma g(K, \vec{H}_\Sigma) = 0. \tag{3.1}$$

(B) *If Σ bounds a finite volume, then*

$$\int_\Sigma g(K, \vec{n}_\Sigma) = 0. \tag{3.2}$$

Proof. For (A), in order to prove (3.1), denote by K_Σ the component of K tangent to Σ. An easy computation gives $\operatorname{div}_\Sigma(K_\Sigma) = g(K, \vec{H}_\Sigma)$. Moreover, since Σ is normal, K_Σ is tangent to $\partial\Sigma$ at every point $p \in \partial\Sigma$ (see Remark 2.2). Hence, $\int_\Sigma g(K, \vec{H}_\Sigma) = \int_\Sigma \operatorname{div}_\Sigma(K_\Sigma) = 0$, by Stokes' theorem.

Let us now prove (B). Since $\partial\Omega_1 = \Sigma \cup (\partial\Omega_1 \cap \partial M)$, and K is tangent to ∂M, we have that

$$\int_\Sigma g(K, \vec{n}_\Sigma) = \int_{\partial\Omega_1} g(K, \vec{n}_{\partial\Omega_1}) = \int_{\Omega_1} \operatorname{div}_g(K) = 0,$$

where the second equality follows from Stokes' theorem, and the third from the fact that Killing vector fields have zero divergence. □

Corollary 3.2. *Let Σ be a normal hypersurface of M, and let $K_1, \dots, K_r$ be Killing vector fields in M such that the corresponding Killing-Jacobi fields $\psi_i \colon \Sigma \to \mathbb{R}$,*

$$\psi_i = g(K_i, \vec{n}_\Sigma), \quad i = 1, \dots, r,$$

are linearly independent. Let h be a continuous function on Σ which is L^2-orthogonal to the space generated by the ψ_i, i.e., $\int_\Sigma h\psi_i = 0$ for all i.

If $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r \in \mathbb{R}$ are such that $H_\Sigma + \sum_{i=1}^r \alpha_i\psi_i = h$, then necessarily $\alpha_i = 0$ for all i (and thus $H_\Sigma = h$).

If Σ bounds a finite volume, then the conclusion above holds for all constant functions h, i.e., the function $H_\Sigma + \sum_{i=1}^r \alpha_i\psi_i$ is constant if and only if H_Σ is constant and $\alpha_i = 0$ for all i.

Proof. Suppose $H_\Sigma + \sum_{i=1}^r \alpha_i\psi_i \equiv h$. Multiplying both sides by $\sum_{i=1}^r \alpha_i\psi_i$ and integrating over Σ, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\Sigma \left(\sum_{i=1}^r \alpha_i\psi_i\right)^2 &= \sum_{i=1}^r \alpha_i \int_\Sigma h\psi_i - \alpha_i \sum_{i=1}^r \int_\Sigma H_\Sigma\psi_i = -\alpha_i \sum_{i=1}^r \int_\Sigma H_\Sigma\psi_i \\ &= -\sum_{i=1}^r \alpha_i \left(\int_\Sigma g(K_i, \vec{H}_\Sigma)\right) \overset{(3.1)}{=} 0,\end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\sum_{i=1}^r \alpha_i\psi_i = 0$. Since the ψ_i are linearly independent, it follows that $\alpha_i = 0$, $i = 1, \dots, r$, and $H_\Sigma = h$, which proves the first statement.

Under the assumption that Σ bounds a finite volume, identity (3.2) implies that any constant function is L^2-orthogonal to the space generated by the ψ_i, and the conclusion above follows. □

Remark 3.3. Statement (B) of Proposition 3.1 and the second statement of Corollary 3.2 hold true for all local Killing fields K defined on a neighborhood of Ω_1, while in statement (A) of Proposition 3.1 and the first statement of Corollary 3.2, it suffices to assume that the Killing fields defined in a neighborhood of Σ.

4. The manifold of normal hypersurfaces

In this section, we give details on the existence of a natural smooth structure on the set of normal hypersurfaces of a Riemannian manifold (M, g) that are *close* to a given compact normal hypersurface Σ in some suitable topology. As usual, perturbations of Σ are parametrized as graphs over Σ of sufficiently small smooth functions $f\colon \Sigma \to \mathbb{R}$. The property of being a normal hypersurface (see Definition 2.1) may not preserved under the normal exponential flow of Σ, unless ∂M is totally geodesic in M. However, up to using the exponential flow of an auxiliary metric for which ∂M is totally geodesic and has the same normal bundle, we may assume without loss of generality for the remainder of this section that ∂M is totally geodesic in (M, g).

A detailed description of the smooth structure on the set of submanifolds with fixed diffeomorphism type can be found in the series of papers by Michor [23, 24, 25], in the C^∞ case. In order to fulfill the appropriate technical requirements of the Implicit Function Theorem, one has to go beyond the C^∞ realm, using embeddings of Hölder class $C^{2,\alpha}$. There are several issues concerning the regularity of the set of unparametrized embeddings in this low regularity setting, which are extensively discussed in [1]. In this paper, however, we are only interested in the smooth structure near a given smooth unparametrized embedding, which avoids all the subtleties involved in the lack of regularity of the change of coordinates.

4.1. **Unparametrized normal embeddings.** The appropriate setup for studying the set of submanifolds of a given diffeomorphism type is obtained by considering the notion of *unparametrized embeddings*. Given a compact manifold Σ, we say that two embeddings $x_1, x_2\colon \Sigma \hookrightarrow M$ are *equivalent* if there exists a diffeomorphism $\phi\colon \Sigma \to \Sigma$ such that $x_1 = x_2 \circ \phi$. Equivalence classes of embeddings are called *unparametrized embeddings of* Σ *in* M.

We denote by $\mathcal{E}(\Sigma, M)$ the space of $C^{2,\alpha}$-unparametrized embeddings of Σ in M, and by $\mathcal{E}_\partial(\Sigma, M)$ the subset of $\mathcal{E}(\Sigma, M)$ consisting of unparametrized embeddings $x\colon \Sigma \hookrightarrow M$ such that $x(\partial\Sigma) \subset \partial M$. Given an embedding $x\colon \Sigma \hookrightarrow M$, we will denote by $[x] \in \mathcal{E}(\Sigma, M)$ the unparametrized embedding defined by x. Note that $[x]$ is uniquely determined by the image $x(\Sigma)$. The notions of *admissible* and *normal* hypersurfaces (Definition 2.1) extend naturally to unparametrized embeddings. Let $\mathcal{E}^\perp_\partial(\Sigma, M)$ denote the subset of $\mathcal{E}_\partial(\Sigma, M)$ consisting of unparametrized *normal* embeddings. Observe that the admissible embeddings form an open subset of $\mathcal{E}^\perp_\partial(\Sigma, M)$, see Remark 2.3.

Proposition 4.1. *Let Σ be a compact manifold with boundary and $x_0\colon \Sigma \hookrightarrow M$ be an admissible smooth normal embedding. A sufficiently small neighborhood of $[x_0]$ in $\mathcal{E}^\perp_\partial(\Sigma, M)$ can be identified with an infinite-dimensional smooth submanifold $\mathcal{N}$*

of the Banach space $C^{2,\alpha}(\Sigma)$, with $0 \in \mathcal{N}$ corresponding to $[x_0]$, such that $T_0\mathcal{N} = C^{2,\alpha}_\partial(\Sigma)$, see (2.4).

Moreover, assume that $K_1, \dots, K_r$ is a family of local Killing vector fields defined in a neighborhood of $x_0(\Sigma)$, and consider the functions $\psi_i = g(K_i, \vec{n}_0)$ in $C^{2,\alpha}_\partial(\Sigma)$. Then, the pseudo-group of local isometries generated by the K_i has a continuous local action on $\mathcal{N}$, and the orbit of 0 under this action is a smooth submanifold of $\mathcal{N}$, of dimension greater than or equal to the dimension of the span of the ψ_i.

Proof. To each sufficiently small $C^{2,\alpha}$-map $f\colon \Sigma \to \mathbb{R}$, we associate the embedding

$$x_f\colon \Sigma \hookrightarrow M, \quad x_f(p) := \exp_{x_0(p)}\big(f(p)\,\vec{n}_0\big), \tag{4.1}$$

where $\vec{n}_0$ is the unit normal vector field along $x_0\colon \Sigma \hookrightarrow M$. Since x_0 is a normal embedding, $\vec{n}_0(p) \in T_p(\partial M)$ for all $p \in x_0(\Sigma) \cap \partial M$, and hence $x_f(\partial\Sigma) \subset \partial M$, because ∂M is totally geodesic. Clearly, if $f \equiv 0$, then $x_f = x_0$. In order to simplify notation, we denote the image of $x_f\colon \Sigma \hookrightarrow M$ by Σ_f; in particular, Σ_0 is the image of the original embedding $x_0\colon \Sigma \hookrightarrow M$.

The above correspondence $f \mapsto \Sigma_f$ gives a bijection from a sufficiently small neighborhood $\mathcal{U}$ of $0 \in C^{2,\alpha}(\Sigma)$ to a neighborhood $\mathcal{V}$ of $[x_0] \in \mathcal{E}_\partial(\Sigma, M)$. Denote by $\mathcal{N}$ the subset of $\mathcal{U}$ consisting of maps f such that x_f is a normal embedding.

Claim 4.2. $\mathcal{N}$ is a submanifold of $C^{2,\alpha}(\Sigma)$.

In order to prove this claim, let $\varepsilon > 0$ be small and consider the diffeomorphism

$$\Phi\colon \Sigma \times [0,\varepsilon) \longrightarrow \mathcal{A}, \quad \Phi(p,t) := \exp_{x_0(p)}\big(t\,\vec{n}_0(p)\big),$$

where $\mathcal{A}$ is an open subset of M containing Σ_0. Note that $\Phi(p,0) = x_0(p)$ is the original normal hypersurface Σ_0, and that $\mathrm{d}\Phi_{(p,t)}$ is an isomorphism for $t > 0$ sufficiently small. In fact,

$$\mathrm{d}\Phi_{(p,0)}(v,\tau) = \tau\, n_0(p) + v, \tag{4.2}$$

for all $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ and $v \in T_p\Sigma_0$. For $(p,t) \in \partial\Sigma \times [0,\varepsilon)$, set

$$\big(\zeta(p,t), X(p,t)\big) := \mathrm{d}\Phi^{-1}_{(p,t)}\big(\vec{n}_{\partial M}(\Phi(p,t))\big) \in T_p\Sigma \times \mathbb{R}; \tag{4.3}$$

note that ζ is a smooth map on $\partial\Sigma \times [0,\varepsilon)$, and X is a smooth time-dependent vector field along $\partial\Sigma$ which is tangent to Σ.

For $f \in \mathcal{U}$, $x_f(p) = \Phi\big(p, f(p)\big)$, and so $T_{x_f(p)}\Sigma_f = \mathrm{Im}\,\big[\mathrm{d}\Phi_{(p,f(p))} \circ \big(\mathrm{Id}, \mathrm{d}f(p)\big)\big]$. Thus,

$$\mathrm{d}\Phi^{-1}_{(p,f(p))}\big[T_{x_f(p)}\Sigma_f\big] = \mathrm{Im}\big(\mathrm{Id}, \mathrm{d}f(p)\big) = \mathrm{Graph}\big(\mathrm{d}f(p)\big). \tag{4.4}$$

The embedding x_f is normal if and only if $\vec{n}_{\partial M}\big(x_f(p)\big) \in T_{x_f(p)}\Sigma_f$ for all $p \in \partial\Sigma$. From (4.3) and (4.4), this condition reads

$$\zeta\big(p, f(p)\big) = \mathrm{d}f(p) \cdot X\big(p, f(p)\big) \quad \text{ for all } p \in \partial\Sigma.$$

In other words, the set of normal embeddings x_f is identified with the inverse image $\eta^{-1}(0)$, where η is the smooth map $C^{2,\alpha}(\Sigma) \ni f \mapsto \eta(f) \in C^{1,\alpha}(\partial\Sigma)$ defined by

$$\eta(f)(p) = \mathrm{d}f(p) \cdot X\big(p, f(p)\big) - \zeta\big(p, f(p)\big), \quad p \in \partial\Sigma.$$

We prove that $\mathcal{N}$ is a smooth submanifold of $C^{2,\alpha}(\Sigma)$ by showing that η is a submersion at $f = 0$. The linearization of η at 0 applied to $\psi \in C^{2,\alpha}(\Sigma)$ reads

$$\mathrm{d}\eta_0(\psi)(p) = \mathrm{d}\psi(p) \cdot X(p,0) - \frac{\partial\zeta}{\partial t}(p,0)\,\psi(p), \quad p \in \partial\Sigma. \tag{4.5}$$

Note that $X(p,0) = \vec{n}_{\partial M}(p)$, which gives a unit orthogonal field along $\partial\Sigma$ (see Remark 2.2).

Claim 4.3. For all $p \in \partial\Sigma$,

$$\frac{\partial\zeta}{\partial t}(p,0) = -\mathrm{I\!I}^{\partial M}\big(\vec{n}_0(p), \vec{n}_0(p)\big). \tag{4.6}$$

Let us first assume the above claim and complete the proof of the theorem.

Proving that $\eta\colon C^{2,\alpha}(\Sigma) \to C^{1,\alpha}(\partial\Sigma)$ is a submersion[1] at $f = 0$ amounts to showing that $\mathrm{d}\eta_0$ is surjective and that $\ker \mathrm{d}\eta_0$ is complemented in $C^{2,\alpha}(\Sigma)$. This is equivalent to the existence of a bounded linear right-inverse for the map $\mathrm{d}\eta_0$. Such a right-inverse is given in Lemma 4.4 below.

Finally, $T_0\mathcal{N} = C^{2,\alpha}_{\partial}(\Sigma)$ follows from $T_0\mathcal{N} = \ker \mathrm{d}\eta_0$, using (4.5), (4.6), and the identity (4.8) below.

As to the natural action of the (pseudo-)group of isometries generated by a family of (local) Killing fields on the set of $C^{2,\alpha}$-unparametrized embeddings, note that this restricts to an action on the set of unparametrized normal embeddings of Σ in M, i.e., a local action on $\mathcal{N}$. This action is only continuous, but the orbit of any smooth map is a smooth submanifold [1, Prop. 5.1]. It is easy to see that the tangent space to the orbit through 0 contains the functions $\psi_i = g(K_i, \vec{n}_0)$. □

Proof of Claim 4.3. Rewrite equation (4.3) as

$$\mathrm{d}\Phi_{(p,t)}\big(\zeta(p,t), X(p,t)\big) = \vec{n}_{\partial M}\big(\Phi(p,t)\big). \tag{4.7}$$

Using (4.2), (4.7), and that $\vec{n}_{\partial M}(p) \in T_p\Sigma_0$ for $p \in \partial\Sigma$, we have:

$$\zeta(p,0) = 0, \quad \text{and} \quad X(p,0) = \vec{n}_{\partial M}(p). \tag{4.8}$$

Fix $p \in \partial\Sigma$, and consider (4.7) as an equality between vector fields along the geodesic $t \mapsto \Phi(p,t)$. Let us differentiate covariantly (using the Levi-Civita connection of g) identity (4.7) at $t = 0$. For $s, t \in \mathbb{R}$ small, set:

$$\rho(t,s) := \mathrm{d}\Phi_{(p,t)}\big(\zeta(p,s), X(p,s)\big),$$

so that the left-hand side of (4.7) is given by $\rho(t,t)$. Denoting covariant derivatives along curves by $\frac{\mathrm{D}}{\mathrm{d}t}$ and $\frac{\mathrm{D}}{\mathrm{d}s}$, we have:

$$\tfrac{\mathrm{D}}{\mathrm{d}t}\big|_{t=0}\rho(t,t) = \tfrac{\mathrm{D}}{\mathrm{d}t}\big|_{t=0}\rho(t,0) + \tfrac{\mathrm{D}}{\mathrm{d}s}\big|_{s=0}\rho(0,s). \tag{4.9}$$

Moreover,

$$\rho(t,0) \overset{(4.8)}{=} \mathrm{d}\Phi_{(p,t)}\big(\vec{n}_{\partial M}(p), 0\big), \qquad \rho(0,s) \overset{(4.2)}{=} \zeta(p,s)\,\vec{n}_0(p) + X(p,s).$$

In order to differentiate $\rho(t,0)$, let us consider a smooth curve $u \mapsto p(u) \in \Sigma_0$ with $p(0) = p$ and $p'(0) = \vec{n}_{\partial M}(p)$, so that $\rho(t,0) = \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}u}\big|_{u=0}\Phi\big(p(u),t\big)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\tfrac{\mathrm{D}}{\mathrm{d}t}\big|_{t=0}\rho(t,0) &= \tfrac{\mathrm{D}}{\mathrm{d}t}\big|_{t=0}\tfrac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}u}\big|_{u=0}\Phi\big(p(u),t\big)\\ &= \tfrac{\mathrm{D}}{\mathrm{d}u}\big|_{u=0}\tfrac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\big|_{t=0}\Phi\big(p(u),t\big) = \tfrac{\mathrm{D}}{\mathrm{d}u}\big|_{u=0}\vec{n}_\Sigma\big(p(u)\big) = \nabla_{\vec{n}_{\partial M}(p)}\vec{n}_0.\end{aligned} \tag{4.10}$$

The derivative of $\rho(0,s)$ is given by

$$\tfrac{\mathrm{D}}{\mathrm{d}s}\big|_{s=0}\rho(0,s) = \frac{\partial\zeta}{\partial t}(p,0)\,\vec{n}_0(p) + \frac{\partial X}{\partial t}(p,0). \tag{4.11}$$

[1] If one considers the Sobolev regularity H^s, $s > 2 + \frac{n}{2}$, then the natural range of the map η is $H^{s-3/2}(\partial\Sigma)$, and the existence of a bounded right-inverse for $\mathrm{d}\eta_0$ is given by the Sobolev Trace Theorem, see for instance [19, Theorem 8.3, p. 39].

Note that, for p fixed, $t \mapsto X(p,t)$ is a curve in the fixed vector space $T_p\Sigma_0$, and $\frac{\partial X}{\partial t}(p,0) \in T_p\Sigma_0$ is the standard derivative of this curve at $t=0$. Finally, the derivative of the right-hand side of (4.7) is given by

$$\tfrac{\mathrm{D}}{\mathrm{d}t}\big|_{t=0}\vec{n}_{\partial M}\big(\Phi(p,t)\big) = \nabla_{\vec{n}_0(p)}\vec{n}_{\partial M}. \tag{4.12}$$

Using (4.9), (4.10) and (4.11), we obtain that the covariant derivative of equation (4.7) at $t=0$ reads (cf. [30, p. 174]):

$$\nabla_{\vec{n}_{\partial M}(p)}\vec{n}_\Sigma + \frac{\partial\zeta}{\partial t}(p,0)\,\vec{n}_\Sigma(p) + \frac{\partial X}{\partial t}(p,0) = \nabla_{\vec{n}_\Sigma(p)}\vec{n}_{\partial M}.$$

Note that the first and the third terms in the left-hand side of the above are tangent to Σ_0. Thus, multiplying both sides by the unit normal vector $\vec{n}_0(p)$ yields

$$\frac{\partial\zeta}{\partial t}(p,0) = g\big(\nabla_{\vec{n}_0(p)}\vec{n}_{\partial M}, \vec{n}_0(p)\big) = -\mathrm{I\!I}^{\partial M}\big(\vec{n}_0(p), \vec{n}_0(p)\big). \qquad \square$$

Lemma 4.4. *There exists a bounded linear map $C^{1,\alpha}(\partial\Sigma) \ni g \mapsto \mathcal{F}_g \in C^{2,\alpha}(\Sigma)$ such that $\mathcal{F}_g \equiv 0$ on $\partial\Sigma$ and $\vec{n}_{\partial M}(\mathcal{F}_g) = g$.*

Proof. The result is obtained with a straightforward partition of unity argument from an extension theorem of Whitney type, see for instance [32, Ch. VI], which gives an analogous result in $\mathbb{R}^n$. For the reader's convenience, a direct and elementary proof of Lemma 4.4 is given in Appendix A. $\square$

5. Deformation of free boundary CMC hypersurfaces

In this section, we give the detailed statement and proof of our main deformation result for free boundary CMC hypersurfaces. This will be a corollary of a slightly more general result, concerning deformations of a free boundary CMC hypersurface by families of free boundary hypersurfaces with *prescribed mean curvature function*. We will consider deformations parameterized by some smooth manifold Λ, with varying background metrics g_λ, $\lambda \in \Lambda$, having a varying group of isometries. A crucial assumption for our theory is a sort of smooth dependence of the ambient symmetries relatively to the parameter λ, which is stated in terms of smooth dependence of the Killing fields of g_λ. The construction has strong analogies with the notion of smooth bundles of Lie groups, introduced in [34] in order to study deformations of immersed CMC tori from $\mathbb{R}^3$ to other space forms. The notion has been further developed in [33] to study isometry groups of deformation of symmetric spaces. For the precise formulation of our result, a certain amount of notations and terminology will be needed.

5.1. Smooth families of Killing fields and equivariant nondegeneracy.

In what follows, we will allow for varying Riemannian metrics on M, and to this aim we will consider the following setup:

(a) Λ is a differentiable manifold;
(b) $(g_\lambda)_{\lambda\in\Lambda}$ is a smooth family of Riemannian metrics on M;
(c) each g_λ defines the same normal bundle $T(\partial M)^\perp$ of ∂M.

Let us now assume that it is given a smooth family $\Lambda \ni \lambda \mapsto \{K_1^\lambda, \dots, K_r^\lambda\}$ of (local) vector fields on M, and let $\Sigma \subset M$ be a compact transversally oriented hypersurface contained in the common domain of the K_i^λ's. As usual, we will denote by $\vec{n}_\Sigma^\lambda$ the g_λ-unit positively oriented normal field along Σ, and by ψ_i^λ the smooth function on Σ defined by $\psi_i^\lambda = g_\lambda\big(\vec{n}_\Sigma^\lambda, K_i^\lambda\big)$.

We will be interested in the above setup mainly under the following circumstances. Assume that

- each K_i^λ is a (local) Killing field for (M, g_λ);
- for a given $\lambda_0 \in \Lambda$, Σ is a free boundary CMC hypersurface of (M, g_{λ_0});
- the maps $\psi_i^{\lambda_0}$, $i = 1, \dots, r$ form a basis of the space of Killing–Jacobi fields along Σ.

In this situation, we will say that $\{K_1^\lambda, \dots, K_r^\lambda\}_{\lambda\in\Lambda}$ *is a smooth frame of Killing–Jacobi fields generators along* Σ near λ_0.

5.2. **Mean curvature deformations.** With this setup, we are now ready to formulate our main result.

Theorem 5.1. *Let $(g_\lambda)_{\lambda\in\Lambda}$ be a smooth family of Riemannian metrics as above, and let $\Sigma_0 \subset M$ be an admissible hypersurface of M that bounds a finite volume. Let $\lambda_0 \in \Lambda$ be fixed, and assume that Σ_0 is an equivariantly nondegenerate free boundary CMC embedding in (M, g_{λ_0}), with mean curvature $h_0 \in \mathbb{R}$. Assume that $\Lambda \ni \lambda \mapsto \{K_1^\lambda, \dots, K_r^\lambda\}$ is a smooth frame of Killing–Jacobi fields generators along Σ near λ_0.*

Then, there exists a neighborhood $\mathcal{U}$ of (h_0, λ_0) in $\mathbb{R} \times \Lambda$ and a smooth family $\mathcal{U} \ni (h, \lambda) \mapsto \Sigma_{(h,\lambda)} \subset M$ of admissible hypersurfaces, such that:

- *for all $(h, \lambda) \in \mathcal{U}$, $\Sigma_{(h,\lambda)}$ is a free boundary hypersurface in (M, g_λ) diffeomorphic to Σ_0 and with constant mean curvature equal to h;*
- $\Sigma_{(h_0,\lambda_0)} = \Sigma_0$.

Moreover, the family $\Sigma_{(h,\lambda)}$ is unique modulo congruence, i.e., if λ' is sufficiently close to λ_0 and Σ' is a free boundary hypersurface of $(M, g_{\lambda'})$ sufficiently close to Σ_0, with mean curvature function $h' \in \mathbb{R}$ sufficiently C^0-close to the (constant) function h_0, then Σ' is congruent to $\Sigma_{(h',\lambda')}$.

Proof. The strategy is to use an Implicit Function Theorem on the space of unparametrized normal embeddings[2] $\mathcal{E}^\perp_\partial(\Sigma, M)$ discussed in Section 4, together with a gauge argument using the flux of Killing fields discussed in Section 3.

Denote by $x_0 \colon \Sigma \hookrightarrow M$ the smooth embedding with image Σ_0, and by $\vec{n}_0$ the inward unit normal along $\Sigma_0 \subset (M, g_{\lambda_0})$. A sufficiently $C^{2,\alpha}$-small neighborhood of $[x_0]$ in $\mathcal{E}^\perp_\partial(\Sigma, M)$ is identified with a smooth submanifold $\mathcal{N} \subset C^{2,\alpha}(\Sigma)$, as in Proposition 4.1. For $f \in \mathcal{N}$, we denote by $x_f \colon \Sigma \hookrightarrow M$ the corresponding embedding and by Σ_f its image. Furthermore, let $\vec{n}_\lambda^f$ be the inward unit normal along $\Sigma_f \subset (M, g_\lambda)$, and H_λ^f be the mean curvature function of $\Sigma_f \subset (M, g_\lambda)$.

Consider the smooth function

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{H} \colon \mathcal{N} \times \mathbb{R}^r \times \Lambda \longrightarrow C^{0,\alpha}(\Sigma) \times \Lambda \\ &\mathcal{H}(f, \alpha, \lambda) := \left(H_\lambda^f + \sum_{i=1}^r \alpha_i \, g_\lambda(K_\lambda^i, \vec{n}_\lambda^f), \lambda \right), \end{aligned} \tag{5.1}$$

where K_λ^i, $i = 1, \dots, r$, are the local Killing vector fields in (M, g_λ) that extend the Killing-Jacobi fields along Σ_0.

Claim 5.2. $\mathcal{H}$ is a submersion near $(0, 0, \lambda_0) \in \mathcal{N} \times \mathbb{R}^r \times \Lambda$.

[2]Since g_λ define the same $T(\partial M)^\perp$, the notion of normal embedding is independent on λ.

Differentiating (5.1) at $(0,0,\lambda_0)$ in the direction (ψ,β,μ), with $\psi \in C^{2,\alpha}_{\partial}(\Sigma)$, $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^r$ and $\mu \in T_{\lambda_0}\Lambda$, gives

$$\mathrm{d}\mathcal{H}(0,0,\lambda_0)[\psi,\beta,\mu] = \left(J_{\lambda_0}\psi + \sum_{i=1}^{r} \beta_i\, g_{\lambda_0}\big(K^i_{\lambda_0}, \vec{n}^0_{\lambda_0}\big) + L_{\lambda_0}\mu\,,\, \mu \right), \tag{5.2}$$

where J_{λ_0} is the Jacobi operator of the CMC hypersurface $\Sigma_0 \subset (M, g_{\lambda_0})$, and

$$L_{\lambda_0} : T_{\lambda_0}\Lambda \longrightarrow C^{0,\alpha}(\Sigma) \tag{5.3}$$

is a linear operator given by the derivative of the map $\Lambda \ni \lambda \mapsto H^0_\lambda \in C^{0,\alpha}(\Sigma)$ at λ_0. Note that the linear map

$$C^{2,\alpha}_{\partial}(\Sigma) \times \mathbb{R}^r \ni (\psi,\beta) \longmapsto J_{\lambda_0}\psi + \sum_{i=1}^{r} \beta_i\, g_{\lambda_0}\big(K^i_{\lambda_0}, \vec{n}^0_{\lambda_0}\big) \in C^{2,\alpha}(\Sigma)$$

is surjective. This follows from the fact that $J_{\lambda_0} \colon C^{2,\alpha}_{\partial}(\Sigma) \to C^{0,\alpha}(\Sigma)$ is an L^2-symmetric Fredholm operator of index 0, and the functions $g_{\lambda_0}\big(K^i_{\lambda_0}, \vec{n}^0_{\lambda_0}\big)$ span its kernel. From (5.2), this implies that $\mathrm{d}\mathcal{H}(0,0,\lambda_0)$ is surjective. It also follows readily from (5.2) that:

$$\ker \mathrm{d}\mathcal{H}(0,0,\lambda_0) = \ker J_{\lambda_0} \times \{0\} \times \{0\},$$

which is a subspace of dimension r in $C^{2,\alpha}_{\partial}(\Sigma) \times \mathbb{R}^r \times T_{\lambda_0}\Lambda$. This completes the proof of Claim 5.2.

Since submersions admit local sections, there exists a neighborhood $\widetilde{\mathcal{U}}$ of (h_0,λ_0) in $C^{0,\alpha}(\Sigma)\times\Lambda$ and a smooth map $\widetilde{\mathcal{U}} \ni (h,\lambda) \mapsto \big(f(h,\lambda), \alpha(h,\lambda), \lambda\big) \in \mathcal{N} \times \mathbb{R}^r \times \Lambda$ such that

(a) $f(h_0,\lambda_0) = 0$
(b) $\mathcal{H}\big(f(h,\lambda),\alpha(h,\lambda),\lambda\big) = (h,\lambda)$, for all $(h,\lambda) \in \mathcal{U}$.

Now, define write $\mathcal{U} = \widetilde{\mathcal{U}} \cap (\mathbb{R}\times\Lambda) = \big\{(h,\lambda) \in \widetilde{\mathcal{U}} : h \text{ is constant}\big\}$. Since Σ_0 is an admissible hypersurface that bounds a finite volume, if $\widetilde{\mathcal{U}}$ is sufficiently small we can assume that $\Sigma_{f(h,\lambda)}$ is also an admissible hypersurface that bounds a finite volume for all $(h,\lambda) \in \widetilde{\mathcal{U}}$, see Remark 2.3. By Corollary 3.2 applied to $\Sigma_{f(h,\lambda)}$, when $(h,\lambda) \in \mathcal{U}$, then $\mathcal{H}\big(f(h,\lambda),\alpha(h,\lambda),\lambda\big) = (h,\lambda)$ implies $\alpha(h,\lambda) = 0$, and so $H^f_\lambda = h$. The desired smooth family is then given by $\Sigma_{(h,\lambda)} := x_{f(h,\lambda)}(\Sigma)$.

As to the uniqueness modulo congruence, we first recall that for $(h,\lambda) \in \mathcal{U}$, $\mathcal{H}^{-1}(h,\lambda)$ is identified with the set of g_λ-free boundary hypersurfaces of M near Σ_0 that are diffeomorphic to Σ_0 and with constant mean curvature equal to h, while the $f(h,\lambda)$-orbit is identified with the set of hypersurfaces of M near Σ_0 that are congruent to $\Sigma_{(h,\lambda)}$. We shall obtain a proof of uniqueness modulo congruence is by showing these two sets coincide near $\Sigma_{(h,\lambda)}$.

Observe that for (h,λ) near (h_0,λ_0), the inverse image $\mathcal{H}^{-1}(h,\lambda)$ is a smooth submanifold of $\mathcal{N}\times\{0\}\times\{\lambda\}$ with dimension $r = \dim\ker \mathrm{d}\mathcal{H}(0,0,\lambda_0)$. On the other hand, for (h,λ) sufficiently close to (h_0,λ_0), the functions $\psi^i_\lambda = g_\lambda\big(K^i_\lambda, \vec{n}^{f(\lambda,h)}_\lambda\big)$ are linearly independent by continuity. This implies that the $f(h,\lambda)$-orbit of the local action on $\mathcal{N}$ by the pseudo-group of local g_λ-isometries generated by the K^i_λ is a smooth manifold of dimension $\geq r$, see Proposition 4.1. Clearly, if f' belongs to this orbit, then $(f',0,\lambda) \in \mathcal{H}^{-1}(h,\lambda)$. This implies that the $f(h,\lambda)$-orbit has in fact dimension equal to r, and that a sufficiently small neighborhood of $\big(f(h,\lambda),0,\lambda\big)$ in $\mathcal{H}^{-1}(h,\lambda)$ contains only elements of the $f(h,\lambda)$-orbit. In other words, any free

boundary CMC hypersurface Σ', with mean curvature equal to h, and sufficiently close to Σ_0, must be congruent to $\Sigma_{(h,\lambda)}$. □

6. Foliations by CMC hypersurfaces

A direct consequence of Theorem 5.1 is that an equivariantly nondegenerate free boundary CMC hypersurface Σ_0 with mean curvature h_0 in (M, g_{λ_0}) belongs to a 1-parameter family of free boundary CMC hypersurfaces $\{\Sigma_r\}_{r\in(-\varepsilon,\varepsilon)}$, with mean curvature $h_0 + r$. A very natural geometric question is to determine whether a tubular neighborhood of Σ_0 in (M, g_{λ_0}) has a *foliation* by free boundary CMC hypersurfaces. In particular, since Σ_r is unique modulo congruence, this amounts to determining whether there exist ambient isometries I_r of (M, g_{λ_0}), with $I_0 = \mathrm{id}$, such that $\{I_r(\Sigma_r)\}_{r\in(-\varepsilon,\varepsilon)}$ is a foliation.

Foliations by CMC hypersurfaces are important geometric objects, with deep ramifications in mathematical physics, see [13, 36]. Deep contributions regarding the problem of foliating a tubular neighborhood of a submanifold with CMC hypersurfaces have been given by Ye [35] and Mazzeo and Pacard [22]. In the former, it is proved that the foliation by geodesic spheres of small radius with center at a nondegenerate critical point of the scalar curvature function can be perturbed to a foliation by CMC spheres. The latter considered simple closed nondegenerate geodesics, proving that a tubular neighborhood can be *partially foliated* with CMC hypersurfaces obtained by perturbing tubes around the geodesic. The main difficulty in obtaining an actual foliation in this case, as well as in higher dimensions, is related to a bifurcation phenomena as the CMC hypersurfaces collapse, see [4, 20].

6.1. **Nondegenerate Σ_0.** Initially, let us make the simplifying assumption that Σ_0 is actually nondegenerate, i.e., there are no non-zero Jacobi fields ψ along Σ_0 satisfying (2.3). In this situation, the Jacobi operator $J_0\colon C^{2,\alpha}_\partial(\Sigma_0) \to C^{0,\alpha}(\Sigma_0)$ is an isomorphism, hence there exists a unique $\psi \in C^{2,\alpha}_\partial(\Sigma_0)$ satisfying

$$J_0(\psi) \equiv 1. \tag{6.1}$$

By elliptic regularity, such a function ψ is smooth.

Proposition 6.1. *If the solution ψ to (6.1) does not have zeros in Σ_0, then the 1-parameter family $\{\Sigma_r\}_{r\in(-\varepsilon,\varepsilon)}$ above is a foliation of a neighborhood of Σ_0.*

Proof. Let $\phi_r \in C^{2,\alpha}_\partial(\Sigma_0)$ be such that $\Sigma_r = \exp(\phi_r\, \vec{n}_{\Sigma_0})$; in particular, $\phi_0 = 0$. Consider the induced variational field along Σ_0, given by $V = \left(\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}r}\big|_{r=0}\phi_s\right)\vec{n}_{\Sigma_0}$. Moreover, let $\psi_V := g(V, \vec{n}_{\Sigma_0}) = \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}r}\big|_{r=0}\phi_r$. Then,

$$J_0(\psi_V) = \tfrac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}r}\big|_{r=0}(h_0 + r) = 1.$$

By uniqueness, $\psi_V = \psi$. Since Σ_0 is embedded, $\Sigma_0 \times \mathbb{R} \ni (p, t) \mapsto \exp_p\left(t\, \vec{n}_{\Sigma_0}(p)\right) \in M$ gives a diffeomorphism from a neighborhood of $\Sigma_0 \times \{0\}$ in $\Sigma_0 \times \mathbb{R}$ onto a neighborhood of Σ_0 in M. By composition, the map $(p, r) \mapsto \exp_p\left(\phi(p)\, \vec{n}_{\Sigma_0}(p)\right)$ is a diffeomorphism from $\Sigma_0 \times (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$ onto a neighborhood U of Σ_0 in M, for $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small.[3] Under this diffeomorphism, the hypersurfaces Σ_r correspond to the slices $\Sigma_0 \times \{r\}$, which form a foliation of U. □

[3]The assumption that $\psi = \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}r}\big|_{r=0}\phi_r$ does not vanish on Σ_0 and compactness of Σ_0 imply that the map $\Sigma_0 \times \mathbb{R} \ni (p, r) \mapsto \big(p, \phi_r(p)\big) \in \Sigma_0 \times \mathbb{R}$ is a diffeomorphism between two neighborhoods of $\Sigma_0 \times \{0\}$ in $\Sigma_0 \times \mathbb{R}$.

6.2. **Equivariantly nondegenerate Σ_0.** Let us now consider the more general case in which Σ_0 is equivariantly nondegenerate (recall Definition 2.4). By Proposition 3.1, the constant function 1 is L^2-orthogonal to every Killing-Jacobi field, and therefore belongs to the image of the Jacobi operator J_0. In particular, equation (6.1) has solutions in $C^{2,\alpha}_{\partial}(\Sigma_0)$.

Proposition 6.2. *If there exists a nonvanishing solution of (6.1), then there exists a neighborhood of Σ_0 foliated by a smooth 1-parameter family of free boundary CMC hypersurfaces $\{I_r(\Sigma_r)\}_{r\in(-\varepsilon,\varepsilon)}$, as described above.*

Proof. It suffices to show that, given a nonvanishing solution ψ to (6.1), there exists a smooth 1-parameter family of maps $\varphi_r \in C^{2,\alpha}_{\partial}(\Sigma_0)$, with $\varphi_0 = 0$ and $\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}r}\big|_{r=0}\varphi_r = \psi$, such that the hypersurface $\exp(\varphi_r\,\vec{n}_{\Sigma_0})$ has constant mean curvature h_0+r, for $|r|$ sufficiently small. Once the existence of such family φ_r is established, the proof follows exactly as in the nondegenerate case (Proposition 6.1).

Applying Theorem 5.1 with a fixed metric g_{λ_0}, we get the existence of a smooth 1-parameter family of maps $\phi_r \in C^{2,\alpha}_{\partial}(\Sigma_0)$, with $\phi_0 = 0$, such that $\Sigma_r = \exp(\phi_r\,\vec{n}_{\Sigma_0})$ has constant mean curvature h_0+r, for $|r|$ sufficiently small. Note that the function $\widetilde{\psi} = \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}r}\big|_{r=0}\phi_r$ is another solution to (6.1). Thus, there exists a local Killing vector field K such that $\psi = \widetilde{\psi}+\psi_K$, where ψ_K is the Killing-Jacobi field (2.5). Denote by $\{I_r\}_{r\in(-\varepsilon,\varepsilon)}$ the local flow of K. Since K is Killing, $I_r(\Sigma_r)$ is a smooth perturbation of Σ_0 with constant mean curvature $h_0 + r$. The corresponding variational field is

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}r}\Big|_{r=0} I_r\left(\exp(\phi_r\,\vec{n}_{\Sigma_0})\right) = \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}r}\Big|_{r=0}\Big[I_r\left(\exp(\phi_0\,\vec{n}_{\Sigma_0})\right) + I_0\left(\exp(\phi_r\,\vec{n}_{\Sigma_0})\right)\Big] = K + V, \tag{6.2}$$

where $V = \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}r}\big|_{r=0}\left(\exp(\phi_r\,\vec{n}_{\Sigma_0})\right) = \widetilde{\psi}\,\vec{n}_{\Sigma_0}$ is the variational vector field corresponding to Σ_r. By Proposition 4.1, there exists a smooth 1-parameter family of maps $\varphi_r \in C^{2,\alpha}_{\partial}(\Sigma_0)$, with $\varphi_0 = 0$, such that $I_r(\Sigma_r) = \exp(\varphi_r\,\vec{n}_{\Sigma_0})$. Finally, from (6.2):

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}r}\Big|_{r=0}\varphi_r = g\big(K+V, \vec{n}_{\Sigma_0}\big) = \psi_K + \widetilde{\psi} = \psi. \qquad \square$$

Remark 6.3. The condition $\psi \neq 0$ for solutions ψ of (6.1) is open in the C^0-topology, since Σ_0 is compact. Therefore, if $r \mapsto \Sigma_r = \exp(\phi_r \cdot \vec{n}_{\Sigma_0})$ is a perturbation of Σ_0 by free boundary CMC hypersurfaces, with $H_{\Sigma_r} = h_0 + r$ for all r, and with $\psi := \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}r}\big|_{r=0}\phi_r \neq 0$ on Σ_0, then any other perturbation $\widetilde{\Sigma}_r$ of Σ_0 sufficiently C^1-close to Σ_r must also foliate a neighborhood of Σ_0.

7. Free boundary disks in the unit ball

The simplest free boundary minimal hypersurface in the unit ball $B^{n+1} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ is the flat disk D^n obtained by intersecting B^{n+1} with a hyperplane in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, which we may assume to be $\mathbb{R}^n = \{e_{n+1}\}^{\perp}$. In this section, as a first example, we apply Theorem 5.1 to verify that D^n can be deformed to free boundary CMC hypersurfaces inside the unit ball of other $(n+1)$-dimensional space forms. We remark that stability issues for such surfaces have been studied in [27, 28, 29, 31].

7.1. **Equivariant nondegeneracy.** We now verify the main hypothesis needed to apply Theorem 5.1, regarding equivariant nondegeneracy of the flat disk. See Lemma 8.1 below for a generalization to other surfaces of revolution.

We begin by noting that the space forms are conformal, and thus define the same normal bundle $T(\partial M)^{\perp}$.

Lemma 7.1. *The flat disk D^n is an equivariantly nondegenerate free boundary minimal hypersurface in B^{n+1}, with nullity equal to n.*

Proof. The Jacobi operator (2.1) of D^n is simply the (nonnegative) Laplacian of the flat metric, as $D^n \subset B^{n+1}$ is totally geodesic and the ambient curvature vanishes. Moreover, the linearized free boundary condition (2.3) reads $\langle \nabla\psi(x), x\rangle = \psi(x)$, since $\partial B^{n+1} = S^n$ is the unit sphere in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$. Altogether, Jacobi fields along D^n are harmonic functions $\psi\colon D^n \to \mathbb{R}$ with Robin boundary conditions:

$$\begin{cases} \Delta\psi = 0 & \text{in } D^n, \\ \frac{\partial\psi}{\partial\vec{n}} = \psi & \text{on } \partial D^n. \end{cases} \tag{7.1}$$

We claim that the space of solutions to (7.1) is spanned by the coordinate functions:

$$f_i(x) := \langle x, e_i\rangle, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \tag{7.2}$$

where $\{e_i\}$ is an orthonormal basis of $\mathbb{R}^n$. Indeed, expanding a solution $\psi = \sum_k \psi_k$ as a sum of homogeneous polynomials ψ_k of degree k (e.g., using the Taylor series at $x = 0$), we have that $\frac{\partial\psi}{\partial\vec{n}} = \sum_k \langle \nabla\psi_k(x), x\rangle = \sum_k k\,\psi_k$, which can only be equal to ψ provided $\psi_k = 0$ for all $k \neq 1$. In other words, ψ must be a homogeneous polynomial of degree 1, hence a linear combination of (7.2). In particular, the nullity of D^n is equal to n.

The space of Killing fields of the flat ball B^{n+1} is identified with the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{o}(n+1)$ of the orthogonal group $\mathsf{O}(n+1)$, as each $A \in \mathfrak{o}(n+1)$ corresponds to the Killing field $K_A(x) = A\,x$, for $x \in B^{n+1} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$. Killing-Jacobi fields on D^n are given by the restriction to D^n of the linear map

$$x \mapsto \langle K_A(x), e_{n+1}\rangle = \sum_{j=1}^{n} a_{n+1,j}\, x_j \tag{7.3}$$

where $A = (a_{ij})$. Since the coefficients $a_{n+1,j}$, $1 \le j \le n$, are arbitrary real numbers, there are n linearly independent Killing-Jacobi fields[4] along D^n, which is hence equivariantly nondegenerate. □

Remark 7.2. From (7.3), we observe that there are no nontrivial rotationally invariant Jacobi fields along the n-disk D^n.

7.2. **Killing fields in space forms.** In order to apply Theorem 5.1 to deform D^n, we still have to verify that the above Killing fields of the flat ambient metric extend to a smooth family of Killing fields of ambient metrics with constant curvature.

Let M^{n+1}_λ be the simply-connected space form of constant curvature λ. We denote by B^{n+1}_λ the unit ball in M^{n+1}_λ, which is a Riemannian manifold with boundary,[5] equipped with the induced metric $g_\lambda := \mathrm{d}r^2 + \mathrm{sn}^2_\lambda(r)\,\mathrm{d}s^2_n$, where $\mathrm{d}s^2_n$ is the standard metric on the unit sphere S^n and

$$\mathrm{sn}_\lambda(r) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda}} \sin\left(r\sqrt{\lambda}\right) & \text{if } \lambda > 0, \\ r & \text{if } \lambda = 0, \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{-\lambda}} \sinh\left(r\sqrt{-\lambda}\right) & \text{if } \lambda < 0. \end{cases}$$

[4]Geometrically, these are infinitesimal rotations of B^{n+1} with rotation axis tangent to D^n.

[5]For simplicity, we only consider $\lambda < \pi^2$, so that the unit ball in M^{n+1}_λ remains a manifold with boundary. Of course, higher values of $\lambda > 0$ can be achieved by rescaling; considering instead of a unit ball, a ball of radius $< \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{\lambda}}$.

Lemma 7.3. *Every Killing field K_0 of B_0^{n+1} belongs to a smooth 1-parameter family K_λ of Killing fields of B_λ^{n+1}.*

Proof. It is a well-known fact that the isometry groups G_λ of M_λ^{n+1} form a smooth bundle of Lie groups over $\mathbb{R}$, and the corresponding Lie algebras $\mathfrak{g}_\lambda$ form a smooth bundle of Lie subalgebras of $\mathfrak{gl}(n+1)$ over $\mathbb{R}$, see e.g. [34] for $n=2$ and [5, Ex. 2.6] for $n \geq 2$. The isometry group of the corresponding unit ball $B_\lambda^{n+1} \subset M_\lambda^{n+1}$ is the subgroup H_λ of G_λ formed by isometries that fix the origin $0 \in B_\lambda^{n+1}$, and the corresponding subalgebras are $\mathfrak{h}_\lambda = \{K_\lambda \in \mathfrak{g}_\lambda : K_\lambda(0) = 0\}$. As $\mathfrak{h}_\lambda$ is a smooth bundle of Lie subalgebras of $\mathfrak{gl}(n+1)$ over $\mathbb{R}$, it follows that every Killing field $K_0 \in \mathfrak{h}_0$ of B_0^{n+1} admits a smooth extension $K_\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}_\lambda$ to a Killing field of B_λ^{n+1}. Alternatively, the smooth dependence on λ of solutions K to $\mathcal{L}_K(g_\lambda) = 0$ can be used to prove that the Killing field K_0 admits an extension K_λ. □

7.3. **Free boundary CMC disks.** We are now ready to apply Theorem 5.1 to deform the flat disk $D^n \subset B^{n+1}$ in the flat unit ball through other CMC disks varying both the values of its mean curvature and of the ambient curvature.

Proposition 7.4. *The flat disk D^n in B_0^{n+1} is the member $\Sigma_{(0,0)}$ of a smooth 2-parameter family of surfaces $\{\Sigma_{(h,\lambda)}\}$, where each $\Sigma_{(h,\lambda)}$ is a free boundary disks with constant mean curvature h inside the unit ball B_λ^{n+1} of constant curvature λ. Each $\Sigma_{(h,\lambda)}$ is invariant under the action of a subgroup of isometries of B_λ^{n+1} isomorphic to $\mathsf{O}(n)$. The family $\{\Sigma_{(h,\lambda)}\}$ is unique modulo congruence, and it is in fact uniquely determined by requiring that each $\Sigma_{(h,\lambda)}$ is invariant by rotations around the x_{n+1}-axis.*

Proof. From Lemma 7.1, the flat disk $D^n \subset B_0^{n+1}$ is equivariantly nondegenerate. By Lemma 7.3, every Killing field of B_0^{n+1} belongs to a smooth 1-parameter family of Killing fields of B_λ^{n+1}. Thus, the existence of $\Sigma_{(h,\lambda)}$ and its uniqueness modulo congruence follow from Theorem 5.1. In order to prove that $\Sigma_{(h,\lambda)}$ have the claimed symmetries, one applies the Implicit Function Theorem in the space of (unparametrized) embeddings into B_λ^{n+1} that are invariant under the action of the subgroup of isometries of B_λ^{n+1} that fix the line spanned by e_{n+1}. This subgroup is isomorphic to the subgroup $\mathsf{O}(n)$ of linear isometries of the hyperplane $\mathbb{R}^n = \{e_{n+1}\}^\perp$. The flat disk is nondegenerate in this space, as there are no non-trivial radial Jacobi fields along D^n, see Remark 7.2. This yields the existence of a smooth family $\Sigma'_{(h,\lambda)}$ with these symmetries, which must be congruent to $\Sigma_{(h,\lambda)}$ by uniqueness. □

Remark 7.5. As in the proof of Proposition 7.4 (and also Proposition 8.2), the standard Implicit Function Theorem may be used on the space of embeddings that are invariant under certain symmetries to obtain the existence of a deformation result for equivariantly nondegenerate free boundary CMC hypersurfaces. Nevertheless, this gauge-fixing approach does not guarantee the *non-existence* of other CMC deformations *without such symmetries*, which is only achieved with Theorem 5.1.

Proposition 7.6. *Let $\Sigma_s = \Sigma_{(h(s),\lambda(s))}$, $s \in [-\delta, \delta]$, be a smooth 1-parameter subfamily of the rotationally invariant family $\{\Sigma_{(h,\lambda)}\}$ given in Proposition 7.4, with $h(0) = 0$, $h'(0) \neq 0$ and $\lambda(0) = 0$.*

Then, for $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small, $\{\Sigma_s\}_{s\in(-\varepsilon,\varepsilon)}$ determines a foliation of a neighborhood of the flat disk $\Sigma_0 = \Sigma_{(0,0)}$ in B^{n+1}.

Proof. We apply a slight generalization of the criterion in Section 6 to verify that $\{\Sigma_s\}$ determines a foliation. Let $[-\delta,\delta] \ni s \mapsto \phi_s \in C^{2,\alpha}(\Sigma)$ be the smooth map such that $\Sigma_s = \exp(\phi_s\,\vec{n}_0)$, and set $\psi := \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}s}\big|_{s=0}\phi_s \in C^{2,\alpha}_{\partial}(D^n)$. Arguing as in Section 6, the conclusion will follow if we show that ψ does not change sign on D^n.

Linearizing the equation $H_{\Sigma_s} = h(s)$ at $s=0$, we find that ψ is a solution to

$$h'(0)\,J_0\psi + \lambda'(0)\,L_0\psi = h'(0), \tag{7.4}$$

where L_0 is the linear operator in (5.3). Note that $\Sigma_{(0,\lambda)}$ is the fixed point set of the reflection about the hyperplane $\mathbb{R}^n = \{e_{n+1}\}^{\perp}$, and this involution is an isometry of B^{n+1}_{λ} for all λ. Thus, $\Sigma_{(0,\lambda)}$ is totally geodesic (in particular, minimal) for all λ and hence $L_0\psi = 0$. Since $h'(0) \neq 0$, we conclude that $\psi \in C^{k,\alpha}_{\partial}(D^n)$ is a solution to (6.1). Similarly to (7.1), it is easy to see that this is equivalent to

$$\begin{cases} \Delta\psi = 1 & \text{in } B^{n+1}, \\ \frac{\partial\psi}{\partial\vec{n}} = \psi & \text{on } \partial B^{n+1}, \end{cases} \tag{7.5}$$

Since each $\Sigma_{(h(s),\lambda(s))}$ is invariant by rotations around the x_{n+1}-axis, then ψ must be a radial function.

Now, we claim that (7.5) admits a unique radial solution. This follows easily from the fact that D^n is nondegenerate as a rotationally invariant CMC free boundary hypersurface in B^{n+1}, see Remark 7.2. Namely, the difference of any two radial solutions of (7.5) would be a radial Jacobi field along D^n. By inspection, one sees that the function $\frac{1}{2n}(|x|^2+1)$ is a radial solution of (7.5), and therefore, by uniqueness, $\psi = \frac{1}{2n}(|x|^2+1)$. Such function is positive on D^n, and this concludes the proof. □

Remark 7.7. Thanks to Remark 6.3, the conclusion of Proposition 7.6 still holds when the family $\{\Sigma_s\}$ does not contain surfaces that are invariant by rotations, but it is C^1-*close* to a family of hypersurfaces that are invariant by rotations around the x_{n+1}-axis.



FIGURE 1. Free boundary CMC spherical caps foliating the unit ball.

8. Free boundary Delaunay annuli in the unit ball

In this section, we apply our main result to prove that a well-studied free boundary minimal surface of the unit ball B^3 in Euclidean space, the critical catenoid, is a member of a 2-parameter family of free boundary CMC surfaces inside the unit ball in a space form. We then identify these surfaces in terms of Delaunay surfaces.

8.1. **Critical catenoid.** Recall that a *catenoid* is a minimal surface in $\mathbb{R}^3$ obtained by rotating a catenary curve

$$x = c\cosh\frac{z}{c}, \quad c > 0, \tag{8.1}$$

about its directrix $x = 0$. Besides affine planes, catenoids are the only minimal surfaces of revolution in $\mathbb{R}^3$. A simple argument shows that the portion of the catenoid generated by (8.1) with $|z| \leq z_c$, where z_c is the positive solution to

$$z_c = c\coth\frac{z_c}{c}, \tag{8.2}$$

is a normal minimal surface inside the ball of radius $r_c = \sqrt{z_c^2 + c^2\cosh^2(z_c/c)}$ centered at the origin. In particular, choosing $c > 0$ such that $r_c = 1$, the portion of



Figure 2. The catenary (8.1) meets the circle of radius r_c orthogonally.

the corresponding catenoid contained in the unit ball B^3 is a free boundary minimal surface, referred to as the *critical catenoid* by Fraser and Schoen [9, 10, 11].

8.2. **Equivariant nondegeneracy.** The key step to apply Theorem 5.1 to deform the critical catenoid is to verify its equivariant nondegeneracy (see Definition 2.4).

Lemma 8.1. *Let Σ be a normal CMC surface of revolution in B^3. If Σ is symmetric with respect to a plane orthogonal to the rotation axis, then its nullity is either 2 or 3. Furthermore, the critical catenoid admits no nontrivial rotationally symmetric Jacobi field satisfying (2.3), has nullity 2 and is equivariantly nondegenerate.*

Proof. We may assume that the rotation axis is the line $x = y = 0$, and that the orthogonal plane is the coordinate plane $z = 0$. The space of Killing-Jacobi fields along Σ is two-dimensional, and spanned by the functions

$$f_i := \langle E_i \times X, \vec{n}_\Sigma \rangle, \quad i = 1, 2, \tag{8.3}$$

where E_1 (resp., E_2) denotes the constant field in the direction of the x-axis (resp., of the y-axis), and X the position vector. In other words, f_1 and f_2 are infinitesimal rotations around the x-axis and y-axis, respectively. Note that each of these Killing-Jacobi fields:

(1) has exactly two nodal domains (see Figure 3);
(2) is not rotationally invariant.



FIGURE 3. Two nodal domains of the Jacobi fields f_1 and f_2.

Let $\big[-\frac{1}{2}L_\gamma, \frac{1}{2}L_\gamma\big] \ni s \mapsto \gamma(s) = \big(x(s), z(s)\big)$ be the unit speed parametrization of the generatrix of Σ in the xz-plane. By the symmetry assumptions, $x > 0$ is an even function, and z is odd. Parametric equations for Σ are hence given by:

$$\big(x(s)\cos\theta,\, x(s)\sin\theta,\, z(s)\big), \quad (s,\theta) \in \big[-\tfrac{1}{2}L_\gamma, \tfrac{1}{2}L_\gamma\big] \times \big[0, 2\pi\big).$$

A unit normal $\vec{n}_\Sigma \colon \Sigma \to S^2$ is given by:

$$\vec{n}_\Sigma(s,\theta) = \big(\dot{z}(s)\cos\theta, \dot{z}(s)\sin\theta, -\dot{x}(s)\big). \tag{8.4}$$

The Laplacian Δ_Σ of the pull-back metric is easily seen to be the operator

$$\Delta_\Sigma = -\frac{1}{x}\frac{\partial}{\partial s}\left(x\,\frac{\partial}{\partial s}\right) - \frac{1}{x^2}\,\frac{\partial^2}{\partial\theta^2},$$

hence the Jacobi operator (2.1) of Σ is given by:

$$J_\Sigma = -\frac{1}{x}\frac{\partial}{\partial s}\left(x\,\frac{\partial}{\partial s}\right) - \frac{1}{x^2}\,\frac{\partial^2}{\partial\theta^2} - \big\|\mathrm{II}^\Sigma\big\|^2. \tag{8.5}$$

By rotational symmetry, $\big\|\mathrm{II}^\Sigma\big\|^2$ depends only on s, and can be explicitly computed as the sum of the squares of the principal curvatures of Σ,

$$\|\mathrm{II}^\Sigma\|^2 = \|\ddot{\gamma}\|^2 + \frac{\dot{z}^2}{x^2} = (\dot{x}\ddot{z} - \ddot{x}\dot{z})^2 + \frac{\dot{z}^2}{x^2}.$$

The linearized free boundary conditions (2.3) for a Jacobi field ψ read:

$$\frac{\partial\psi}{\partial s}\big(-\tfrac{1}{2}L_\gamma,\theta\big) + \psi\big(-\tfrac{1}{2}L_\gamma,\theta\big) = 0, \quad \frac{\partial\psi}{\partial s}\big(\tfrac{1}{2}L_\gamma,\theta\big) - \psi\big(\tfrac{1}{2}L_\gamma,\theta\big) = 0.$$

Separation of variables $\psi = S(s)\,\Theta(\theta)$ for the above problem gives the following pair of linear ODEs on S and Θ:

$$-(xS')' + \left(\frac{\kappa}{x} - x\left\|\mathrm{I\!I}^{\Sigma}\right\|^2\right) S = 0 \tag{8.6}$$

$$\Theta'' + \kappa\Theta = 0 \tag{8.7}$$

and boundary conditions

$$S'\big(-\tfrac{1}{2}L_\gamma\big) + S\big(-\tfrac{1}{2}L_\gamma\big) = 0, \quad S'\big(\tfrac{1}{2}L_\gamma\big) - S\big(\tfrac{1}{2}L_\gamma\big) = 0. \tag{8.8}$$

In (8.6) and (8.7), κ is an arbitrary real constant. Equation (8.7) admits periodic solutions only when $\kappa = n^2$, for some nonnegative integer n. Hence, a basis for $\ker J_\Sigma$ is given by functions of the form $S_n(s)\cdot\sin(n\theta)$ and $S_n(s)\cdot\cos(n\theta)$, where n is some nonnegative integer for which there exists a nontrivial solution S_n of the boundary value problem

$$-(xS')' + \left(\frac{n^2}{x} - x\|\mathrm{I\!I}^{\Sigma}\|^2\right) S = 0, \tag{8.9}$$

with boundary conditions (8.8).

Using the properties (1) and (2) of the Killing-Jacobi fields f_i, it is easy to see that f_1 and f_2 correspond respectively to $S_1\sin\theta$ and $S_1\cos\theta$, where S_1 is the solution of (8.9) with $n = 1$, satisfying (8.8). Since f_1 and f_2 have exactly two nodal domains, it follows that S_1 has no zero in $\big[-\frac{1}{2}L_\gamma, \frac{1}{2}L_\gamma\big]$.

Consider (8.9) as a Sturm-Liouville equation

$$-(xS')' - x\|\mathrm{I\!I}^{\Sigma}\|^2 S = \lambda\cdot\tfrac{1}{x}S, \tag{8.10}$$

with $\lambda = -n^2$, $n\in\mathbb{N}$. When $n = 1$, the solution of (8.10) satisfying (8.8) is S_1. Since it has no zero in $\big[-\frac{1}{2}L_\gamma, \frac{1}{2}L_\gamma\big]$, it follows from Sturm-Liouville theory that the first eigenvalue of (8.10) must be $\lambda_1 = -1$. In particular, there is no nontrivial solution of (8.10) satisfying (8.8) when $\lambda = -n^2$, $n > 1$. Thus, $\ker J_\Sigma$ is spanned by f_1, f_2 and at most one more rotationally symmetric Jacobi field satisfying (8.8), corresponding to a solution of (8.10) when $\lambda = 0$. This shows that the nullity of Σ is either 2 or 3.

Let us show that there cannot be a solution of (8.10) with $\lambda = 0$ satisfying (8.8) when Σ is the critical catenoid. We claim that any such solution S_0 must be either an even or an odd function of s. Note that $\widetilde{S}_0(s) := S_0(-s)$ also solves (8.10) and (8.8). As the space of solutions has dimension ≤ 1, we have $\widetilde{S}_0 = \alpha\, S_0$, for some $\alpha\in\mathbb{R}$. Iteration gives $\alpha^2 = 1$, hence $\alpha = \pm 1$, proving the claim. Furthermore, disregarding boundary conditions, (8.10) admits two linearly independent solutions; one even and one odd. The odd solution is the rotationally symmetric Jacobi field ν_3 along Σ, given by the normal component of the Killing field E_3 of translations parallel to the z-axis. The even solution is given by the *support function* $q_\Sigma\colon\Sigma\to\mathbb{R}$, $q_\Sigma = \langle X, \vec{n}_\Sigma\rangle$, where X is the position vector. From (8.4), we have that

$$\nu_3 = \dot{x} \quad\text{and}\quad q_\Sigma = x\dot{z} - z\dot{x}. \tag{8.11}$$

Note that q_Σ is a Jacobi field only along minimal surfaces,[6] and it vanishes along $\partial\Sigma$, since Σ is normal. Thus, the space of odd solutions of (8.10) has dimension 1, as well as the space of even solutions of (8.10). This implies that S_0 must be

[6] If $X\colon\Sigma\to\mathbb{R}^3$ is a surface in $\mathbb{R}^3$ with constant mean curvature H_Σ and support function q_Σ, then $J_\Sigma q_\Sigma = -2H_\Sigma$. In fact, q_Σ can be written as $\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\big|_{t=1}\langle X_t, \vec{n}_\Sigma\rangle$, where $X_t = tX$ is a CMC variation of X with mean curvature $H(X_t) = \frac{1}{t}H_\Sigma$.

a multiple of either ν_3 or q_Σ, according to its parity. A direct computation shows that the unit speed parametrization $\gamma(s) = (x(s), z(s))$ of the catenary (8.1) is

$$x(s) = c\sqrt{1+\frac{s^2}{c^2}}, \quad z(s) = c\log\left(\frac{s}{c}+\sqrt{1+\frac{s^2}{c^2}}\right), \tag{8.12}$$

and $L_\gamma = 2c\sinh(z_c/c)$. It is easy to verify that neither of (8.11) satisfy the boundary conditions (8.8). Thus, there is no nontrivial solution of (8.10) with $\lambda = 0$ satisfying (8.8), hence the critical catenoid is equivariantly nondegenerate. □

8.3. **Delaunay annuli.** Since the critical catenoid is equivariantly nondegenerate, it can be deformed through other CMC annuli (which we later identify as *Delaunay annuli*) varying both the values of its mean curvature and of the ambient curvature.

Proposition 8.2. *The critical catenoid is the member $\Sigma_{(0,0)}$ of a smooth 2-parameter family $\Sigma_{(h,\lambda)}$ of free boundary annuli with constant mean curvature h inside the unit ball B^3_λ of constant curvature λ, which is unique modulo congruence. Each $\Sigma_{(h,\lambda)}$ is rotationally symmetric, and invariant with respect to reflection about a plane orthogonal to the rotation axis. In particular, fixing the axis of rotational symmetry determines $\Sigma_{(h,\lambda)}$ uniquely.*

Proof. From Lemma 8.1, the critical catenoid $\Sigma_0 \subset B^3_0$ is equivariantly nondegenerate. By Lemma 7.3, every Killing field of B^3_0 belongs to a smooth 1-parameter family of Killing fields of B^3_λ. Thus, the existence of $\Sigma_{(h,\lambda)}$ and its uniqueness modulo congruence follow from Theorem 5.1. In order to prove that $\Sigma_{(h,\lambda)}$ have the claimed symmetries, one applies the Implicit Function Theorem on the space of (unparametrized) embeddings into B^3_λ that are invariant under rotations around the z-axis and reflections about the xy-plane. Indeed, the critical catenoid is nondegenerate in this space, as it does not admit nontrivial rotationally symmetric even Jacobi fields (see Lemma 8.1). This yields the existence of a smooth family $\Sigma'_{(h,\lambda)}$ with these symmetries, which must be congruent to $\Sigma_{(h,\lambda)}$ by uniqueness. □

Proposition 8.3. *Fix a line ℓ through the origin in $\mathbb{R}^3$, and let Σ_h be the free boundary CMC annulus $\Sigma_{(h,0)}$ in B^3_0 from Proposition 8.2 which is rotationally symmetric with respect to ℓ. For $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small, $\{\Sigma_h\}_{h\in(-\varepsilon,\varepsilon)}$ determines a foliation of a neighborhood of the critical catenoid $\Sigma_0 = \Sigma_{(0,0)}$.*

Proof. Without loss of generality we may assume that ℓ is the z-axis. From Proposition 8.2, Σ_h is invariant under reflections about the xy-plane. Let V be the variational field along Σ_0 corresponding to the variation Σ_h, and set $\psi := \langle V, \vec{n}_0\rangle$, where $\vec{n}_0$ is the unit normal along Σ_0. Clearly, ψ is a solution to (6.1). From Proposition 6.2, it suffices to show that ψ does not have zeros in Σ_0.

By the symmetries of Σ_h, it is easily deduced that ψ is obtained from an even solution S_0 to (8.9) with $n = 0$, satisfying the boundary conditions (8.8). In these equations, we consider the data (8.12) corresponding to the critical catenoid Σ_0. Furthermore, up to rescaling, we may assume $c = 1$. Direct computations show that solutions of this boundary value problem satisfy

$$-S'' - \frac{s}{1+s^2}S' - \frac{2}{(1+s^2)^2}S = 1, \tag{8.13}$$

with boundary conditions

$$S'(-s_1) + S(-s_1) = 0, \quad \text{and} \quad S'(s_1) - S(s_1) = 0, \tag{8.14}$$

with $s_1 := \sinh z_1$, where z_1 is the positive solution to $z_1 = \coth z_1$. The general solution to (8.13) satisfying $S(0) = c_1$ and $S'(0) = c_2$ is given by

$$S(s) = (c_1 - \tfrac{1}{4}s^2) + \frac{s}{\sqrt{1+s^2}}\big(c_2 - (c_1 + \tfrac{1}{4})\sinh^{-1} s\big). \tag{8.15}$$

There is exactly one solution S_0 to (8.13) and (8.14), which is an even function. In order to obtain S_0, we set $c_2 := 0$ and

$$c_1 := -\frac{1}{4}\left(\frac{z_1^2+1}{z_1^2-1} - \frac{z_1^2}{(z_1^2-1)^{3/2}}\right) = -\frac{1}{4}(\cosh 2z_1 - \cosh^2 z_1 \sinh z_1), \tag{8.16}$$

so that the first condition in (8.14) is satisfied. This suffices to ensure that (8.14) is satisfied, since S_0 is even. Straightforward numeric estimates give $c_1 \in (-\frac{1}{4}, 0)$, more precisely, $c_1 \cong -0.152$. Direct inspection of (8.15) shows that $S_0(s) < 0$ for $s \in [-s_1, s_1]$, hence ψ does not have zeros on Σ_0, concluding the proof. □

Constant mean curvature surfaces of revolution in $\mathbb{R}^3$ are commonly known as *Delaunay surfaces*, as they were classified by Delaunay [7] in 1841. Their generatrix was ingeniously observed to be the *roulette* γ of some conic section β, which is the curve traced by one of the foci of β as it rolls without slipping along a line ℓ. Parametrizing the line and the conic section as $\ell\colon \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{C}$ and $\beta\colon \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{C}$ respectively, with $\ell(0) = \beta(0)$, $\ell'(0) = \beta'(0)$, and $|\ell'(s)| = |\beta'(s)| = 1$, the parametrization $\gamma\colon \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{C}$ for the corresponding roulette is easily derived to be

$$\gamma(s) = \ell(s) - \frac{\ell'(s)}{\beta'(s)}\big(\beta(s) - \gamma(0)\big), \quad s \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{8.17}$$

where the starting point $\gamma(0) \in \mathbb{C}$ is to be chosen as one of the foci of β.

Conic sections β depend smoothly on two positive parameters, called *eccentricity* e and *focal parameter* p. The conic is a circle, ellipse, parabola or hyperbola respectively when $e = 0$, $e \in (0,1)$, $e = 1$ or $e \in (1, +\infty)$, while p is the distance between one of the foci and the directrix, and serves as a rescaling parameter. In



FIGURE 4. The conics (8.18) with $e > 0$ and $p = 1$. The curves in red are ellipses ($0 < e < 1$), the curve in blue is a parabola ($e = 1$) and the curves in green are hyperbolas ($e > 1$).

polar coordinates, a conic with eccentricity $e > 0$, focal parameter $p > 0$ and one of the foci at the origin is given by

$$r(\theta) = \frac{e\,p}{1 + e\cos\theta}. \tag{8.18}$$

Reparametrizing $\widetilde{\beta}(\theta) = r(\theta)\cos\theta + i\, r(\theta)\sin\theta$ by arc length, one obtains the conic $\beta\colon \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{C}$ and hence the corresponding roulette γ via (8.17), using $\gamma(0) = 0$ and $\ell(s) = \frac{e\,p}{1+e} + i\, s$, see Figure 5. Since β and ℓ depend smoothly on p and e, the roulette



FIGURE 5. Roulette γ traced by one of the foci of the conic β as it rolls along the line ℓ, and the corresponding surface of revolution.

γ given by (8.17) and hence the corresponding Delaunay surface $\mathcal{D}$ in $\mathbb{R}^3$ also depends smoothly on these 2 parameters. Thus, Delaunay surfaces are members of a smooth 2-parameter family $\mathcal{D}_{(e,p)}$ of CMC surfaces of revolution, obtained by revolving the roulette γ of a conic with eccentricity e and focal parameter p around the line ℓ.[7] The mean curvature of $\mathcal{D}_{(e,p)}$ can be computed to be

$$H(e,p) = \frac{|e^2 - 1|}{e\,p}. \tag{8.19}$$

The surface $\mathcal{D}_{(e,p)}$ is called an *unduloid*, *catenoid* or *nodoid* according to the cases $0 < e < 1$, $e = 1$ and $e > 1$ respectively, that is, depending on the originating conic β being an ellipse, parabola or hyperbola, see Figure 6. The parameter $p > 0$ corresponds to ambient homotheties, as the rescaled surface $\alpha\,\mathcal{D}_{(e,p)}$ is congruent to $\mathcal{D}_{(e,\alpha p)}$. Together with round cylinders and round spheres, which correspond to limits $e = 0$ and $e = +\infty$, these are all the CMC surfaces of revolution in $\mathbb{R}^3$.

As above, up to ambient isometries, assume that the rotation axis ℓ of the Delaunay surface $\mathcal{D}_{(e,p)}$ is the z-axis, and that the roulette γ is contained in the xz-plane.

[7] An explicit parametrization of $\mathcal{D}_{(e,p)}$ involves elliptic integrals (needed to parametrize β by arc length), and can be found, e.g., in [3, 7, 17].



FIGURE 6. Compact portions of an unduloid, a catenoid and a nodoid in $\mathbb{R}^3$, and the corresponding half sections.

In this case, the portion of $\mathcal{D}_{(e,p)}$ contained in the ball $B^3(\varrho) \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ of radius ϱ centered at the origin is a normal surface in $B^3(\varrho)$ if and only if the tangent line to γ at the point $\gamma(s_*)$, for which $|\gamma(s_*)| = \varrho$, passes through the origin (cf. Figure 2). As γ depends smoothly on the eccentricity e and focal parameter p of the corresponding rolling conic, the Implicit Function Theorem can be used to show that there exists a smooth function $\varrho(e,p)$, linear in p, such that $\mathcal{D}_{(e,p)} \cap B^3(\varrho(e,p))$ is a normal surface in $B^3(\varrho(e,p))$. Thus, Delaunay surfaces provide a smooth 1-parameter family

$$\mathcal{A}_e := \mathcal{D}_{(e,\rho(e,1))} \cap B^3(1) \tag{8.20}$$

of free boundary annuli in the unit ball, with constant mean curvature $h(e) := H(e, \varrho(e,1))$, see also [29]. From the above discussion, the surface $\mathcal{A}_1$ is the critical catenoid. By the uniqueness modulo congruence in Proposition 8.2, it follows that $\Sigma_{(h(e),0)}$ must be congruent to the Delaunay annulus $\mathcal{A}_e$. Notice that $\{\mathcal{A}_e\}_{e\in(0,+\infty)}$ form a foliation of B^3, cf. Proposition 8.3.

Delaunay surfaces also exist in the other space forms $\mathbb{S}^3$ and $\mathbb{H}^3$, and can be described as the rotationally symmetric CMC surfaces in such spaces, see [12, 14]. Just as in the Euclidean case, these Delaunay surfaces induce free boundary CMC surfaces in any unit ball with constant curvature, see [31]. By a uniqueness modulo congruence argument similar to the above, the surfaces in the family $\Sigma_{(h,\lambda)}$ from Proposition 8.2 can be identified as Delaunay annuli in $\mathbb{H}^3(1/\sqrt{-\lambda})$ or $\mathbb{S}^3(1/\sqrt{\lambda})$, according to $\lambda < 0$ or $\lambda > 0$.

Appendix A. Proof of Lemma 4.4

Let $d, k > 0$ be fixed integers. Given a continuous function $h\colon \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$, the map $F_h\colon \mathbb{R}^{d+1} \to \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$F_h(x_1,\dots,x_d,z) = \frac{1}{z^{d-1}} \int_{Q(x_1,\dots,x_d,z)} h(s_1,\dots,s_d)\,\mathrm{d}s_1\dots\mathrm{d}s_d, \tag{A.1}$$

where $Q(x_1,\dots,x_d,z)$ is the cube given by the cartesian product $\prod_{i=1}^{d}\left[x_i - \frac{z}{2}, x_i + \frac{z}{2}\right]$, satisfies the following properties:

- it admits a continuous extension to the hyperplane $z = 0$ by setting
$$F_h(x_1,\dots,x_d,0) = 0;$$
- it is of class C^1 on $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$;
- all its partial derivatives have the same regularity as h (in particular, F_h is of class $C^{k+1,\alpha}$ on $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ if h is of class $C^{k,\alpha}$);
- $\dfrac{\partial F_h}{\partial z}(x_1,\dots,x_d,0) = h(x_1,\dots,x_d)$ for all $(x_1,\dots,x_d)$;
- it depends linearly on h.

Remark A.1. Using induction, one can show that if h is of class C^k, for all $j \le k$, the partial derivatives of order j of F_h are linear combinations of integrals of the partial derivatives of order up to $j-1$ of the function h, composed with linear functions in the variables.

Proposition A.2. *Let Σ be a compact Riemannian n-manifold with boundary $\partial\Sigma$, and let $\vec{\nu}$ denote the unit normal vector field along $\partial\Sigma$ pointing inward.*[8] *For all $k \ge 0$ and $\alpha \in (0,1]$ there exists a bounded linear map $C^{k,\alpha}(\partial\Sigma) \ni g \mapsto \mathcal{F}_g \in C^{k+1,\alpha}(\Sigma)$ such that $\mathcal{F}_g \equiv 0$ on $\partial\Sigma$ and $\vec{\nu}(\mathcal{F}_g) = g$ for all $g \in C^{k-1,\alpha}(\partial\Sigma)$.*

Proof. Choose a finite set of local charts (U_r, φ_r), $r = 1,\dots,N$ on Σ satisfying the following properties:

(a) U_r is a connected open subset of Σ, with $U_r \cap \partial\Sigma \neq \emptyset$ for all r;
(b) $U := \bigcup_{r=1}^{N} U_r$ is an open neighborhood of $\partial\Sigma$;
(c) φ_r is a diffeomorphism from U_r onto $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}\times[0,+\infty)$ carrying $\partial\Sigma \cap U_r$ onto $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}\times\{0\}$;
(d) $(\mathrm{d}\varphi_r)_p(\vec{\nu}_p) = \frac{\partial}{\partial z}$ for all $p \in \partial\Sigma \cap U_r$.

Set $U_0 = \Sigma \setminus \partial\Sigma$, so that $(U_r)_{r=0,\dots,N}$ is an open cover of Σ, and let $(\psi_r)_{r=0}^{N}$ be a smooth partition of unity subordinated to such cover.

Given $g \in C^{k,\alpha}(\partial\Sigma)$, for all r, consider the function $h_r = g\circ\varphi_r^{-1}\colon \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \to \mathbb{R}$, which is of class $C^{k,\alpha}$. Let $F_{h_r}\colon \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ be the $C^{k+1,\alpha}$-extension of h_r defined in formula (A.1), and set $\mathcal{F}_r = F_{g_r}\circ\varphi_r$ be the corresponding $C^{k+1,\alpha}$-map on U_r. Finally, define a $C^{k+1,\alpha}$ function on Σ as

$$\mathcal{F}_g = \sum_{r=1}^{N} \psi_r \cdot \mathcal{F}_r.$$

Let us check that $\mathcal{F}_g$ has the desired properties. Clearly, $\mathcal{F}_g$ depends linearly on g. The continuity of $\mathcal{F}$ is obtained from the observation in Remark A.1. Since all the

[8] Observe that here we use a different convention for the orientation of the normal.

F_r vanish on $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}\times\{0\}$, by (c) all the $\mathcal{F}_r$ vanish on $\partial\Sigma$, hence $\mathcal{F}_g$ vanish on $\partial\Sigma$. Since $\frac{\partial F_{g_r}}{\partial z}(x_1,\dots,x_{n-1},0)=g_r(x_1,\dots,x_{n-1})$, by (d) we get $\vec{\nu}_p(\mathcal{F}_r)=g(p)$ for all $p\in\partial\Sigma\cap U_r$. On the other hand, if $p\in\partial\Sigma\setminus U_r$, then $\psi_r(p)=0$. Hence, for $p\in\partial\Sigma$:

$$\vec{\nu}_p\big(\mathcal{F}_g\big)=\sum_{r=1}^{N}\big[\vec{\nu}_p(\psi_r)\cdot\mathcal{F}_r(p)+\psi_r(p)\vec{\nu}_p(\mathcal{F}_r)\big]=\sum_{r=1}^{N}\psi_r(p)g(p)=g(p).$$

This concludes the proof. □

References

[1] L. J. Alías, P. Piccione, *On the manifold structure of the set of unparametrized embeddings with low regularity*, Bull. Braz. Math. Soc. (N.S.) 42 (2011), no. 2, 171-183.

[2] T. Aubin, *Some nonlinear problems in Riemannian geometry*, Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1998.

[3] E. Bendito, M. Bowick and A. Medina, *A natural parameterization of the roulettes of the conics generating the Delaunay surfaces*. J. Geom. Symmetry Phys. 33 (2014), 27–45.

[4] R. G. Bettiol and P. Piccione, *Delaunay type hypersurfaces in cohomogeneity one manifolds*. arXiv:1306.6043.

[5] R. G. Bettiol, P. Piccione, G. Siciliano, *Deforming solutions of geometric variational problems with varying symmetry groups*, Transform. Groups 19 (2014), no. 4, 941–968.

[6] R. G. Bettiol, P. Piccione, G. Siciliano, *On the equivariant implicit function theorem with low regularity and applications to geometric variational problems*, Proc. Edinb. Math. Soc. (2) 58 (2015), no. 1, 53–80.

[7] C. Delaunay, *Sur la surface de révolution dont la courbure moyenne est constante*, J. Math. Pures et Appl. Sér. 1 6 (1841), 309–320.

[8] A. Fraser and M. Li, *Compactness of the space of embedded minimal surfaces with free boundary in three-manifolds with nonnegative Ricci curvature and convex boundary*. J. Differential Geom. 96 (2014), no. 2, 183-200.

[9] A. Fraser, R. Schoen, *The first Steklov eigenvalue, conformal geometry, and minimal surfaces*. Adv. Math. 226 (2011), no. 5, 4011-4030.

[10] A. Fraser, R. Schoen, *Minimal surfaces and eigenvalue problems*. Geometric analysis, mathematical relativity, and nonlinear partial differential equations, 105-121, Contemp. Math., 599, AMS, Providence, RI, 2013.

[11] A. Fraser, R. Schoen, *Sharp eigenvalue bounds and minimal surfaces in the ball*, arXiv:1209.3789.

[12] W.-Y. Hsiang and W. Yu, *A generalization of a theorem of Delaunay*. J. Differential Geom. 16 (1981), no. 2, 161–177.

[13] G. Huisken and S.-T. Yau, *Definition of center of mass for isolated physical systems and unique foliations by stable spheres with constant mean curvature*. Invent. Math. 124 (1996), no. 1-3, 281–311.

[14] R. Hynd, S.-H. Park and J. McCuan, *Symmetric surfaces of constant mean curvature in S^3*, Pacific J. Math. 241, No. 1 (2009), 63–115.

[15] N. Kapouleas, *Constant mean curvature surfaces in Euclidean three-space*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.) 17 (1987), no. 2, 318-320.

[16] N. Kapouleas, *Complete constant mean curvature surfaces in Euclidean three-space*, Ann. of Math. (2) 131 (1990), no. 2, 239-330.

[17] K. Kenmotsu, *Surfaces of revolution with prescribed mean curvature*. Tohoku Math. J. (2) 32 (1980), no. 1, 147–153.

[18] M. Koiso, P. Piccione, T. Shoda, *On bifurcation and local rigidity of triply periodic minimal surfaces in $\mathbb{R}^3$*, arXiv:1408.0953.

[19] J.-L. Lions, E. Magenes, *Non-homogeneous boundary value problems and applications*. Vol. I., Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, Band 181. Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg, 1972.

[20] F. Mahmoudi, R. Mazzeo and F. Pacard, *Constant mean curvature hypersurfaces condensing on a submanifold*. Geom. Funct. Anal. 16 (2006), no. 4, 924–958.

[21] D. Maximo, I. Nunes, G. Smith, *Free boundary minimal annuli in convex three-manifolds*. arXiv:1312.5392.

[22] R. Mazzeo and F. Pacard, *Foliations by constant mean curvature tubes.* Comm. Anal. Geom. 13 (2005), no. 4, 633–670.
[23] P. Michor, *Manifolds of smooth maps*, Cahiers Topologie Géom. Différentielle 19 (1978), no. 1, 47–78.
[24] P. Michor, *Manifolds of smooth maps. II. The Lie group of diffeomorphisms of a noncompact smooth manifold*, Cahiers Topologie Géom. Différentielle 21 (1980), no. 1, 63–86.
[25] P. Michor, *Manifolds of smooth maps. III. The principal bundle of embeddings of a noncompact smooth manifold*, Cahiers Topologie Géom. Différentielle 21 (1980), no. 3, 325–337.
[26] F. Pacard and M. Ritoré, *From constant mean curvature hypersurfaces to the gradient theory of phase transitions*, J. Differential Geom. 64 (2003), no. 3, 359–423.
[27] A. Ros, *Stability of minimal and constant mean curvature surfaces with free boundary*, Mat. Contemp. 35 (2008), 221–240.
[28] A. Ros and R. Souam, *On stability of capillary surfaces in a ball.* Pacific J. Math. 178 (1997), no. 2, 345–361.
[29] A. Ros and E. Vergasta, *Stability for hypersurfaces of constant mean curvature with free boundary*, Geom. Dedicata 56 (1995), no. 1, 19–33.
[30] R. Schoen, *Minimal submanifolds in higher codimension.* XIV School on Differential Geometry, Mat. Contemp. 30 (2006), 169-199.
[31] R. Souam, *On stability of stationary hypersurfaces for the partitioning problem for balls in space forms.* Math. Z. 224 (1997), no. 2, 195–208.
[32] E. M. Stein, *Singular integrals and differentiability properties of functions*, Princeton Mathematical Series, No. 30 Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J. 1970.
[33] H. Tasaki, M. Umehara and K. Yamada, *Deformations of symmetric spaces of compact type to their noncompact duals*, Japan J. Math. (N.S.) 17 (1991), no. 2, 383–399.
[34] M. Umehara and K. Yamada, *A deformation of tori with constant mean curvature in* $\mathbb{R}^3$ *to those in other space forms*, Trans. AMS 330, No. 2 (1992), 845–857.
[35] R. Ye, *Foliation by constant mean curvature spheres.* Pacific J. Math. 147 (1991), no. 2, 381–396.
[36] R. Ye, *Foliation by constant mean curvature spheres on asymptotically flat manifolds.* Geometric analysis and the calculus of variations, 369–383, Int. Press, Cambridge, MA, 1996.

University of Notre Dame
Department of Mathematics
255 Hurley Building
Notre Dame, IN, 46556-4618, USA
E-mail address: rbettiol@nd.edu

Universidade de São Paulo
Departamento de Matemática
Rua do Matão, 1010
São Paulo, SP, 05508-090, Brazil
E-mail address: piccione@ime.usp.br

The City College of New York, CUNY
Mathematics Department
138th St and Convent Avenue, NAC 4/112B
New York, NY, 10031, USA
E-mail address: bsantoro@ccny.cuny.edu